

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner Objections – Specification

The specification was objected to because the application does not contain an abstract, informality referring to the title and because in Figure 2, no reference numbers are used for reference in the specification. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the specification. In response, the Applicant has modified the specification as required by the Examiner and a correction to the drawing is shown on the enclosed sheet. The Examiner's consideration of the amendments to the specification and drawing is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Roch Glitho (US 6,178,181 hereinafter Glitho). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Glitho reference describes a method of modifying a signalling protocol stack to transmit a Signalling System no. 7 (SS7) telecommunications message over a data network from an originator node to a destination node. The method comprises a step of replacing the Message Transfer Part (MTP) protocol layer with an Internet Protocol (IP) layer, a step of adding between a Signalling Connection Control Part (SCCP) protocol layer and the IP layer an SCCP-IP mapping function, a step of mapping the SS7 signalling message from the SCCP protocol layer in the originating node into an IP-message utilising the SCCP-IP mapping function, and a step of sending the IP message over the data network from the originating node to the destination node (col. 2 lines 8-17).

A conventional SS7 stack comprises a Translation Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) layer serving an application both located at a layer 7 of an OSI model, a Signalling Connection Control Part (SCCP) layer located at a layer 3 of an OSI model, and on top of a Message Transfer Part (MTP) protocol layer that further includes an

MTP-3 layer also located at a layer 3 of an OSI model, an MTP-2 located at a layer 2 of an OSI model, and an MTP-1 located at a layer 1 of an OSI model (col. 3 lines 41-56 in combination with Fig. 1 and Fig. 2).

Glitho clearly replaces the whole MTP protocol layer, namely MTP-1, MTP-2 and MTP-3, with an IP layer and places an SCCP-IP mapping function directly between the SCCP layer and the IP-layer. Moreover, Glitho claims as the heart of the invention the fact of having the SCCP-IP mapping function directly between the SCCP layer and the IP-layer thus allowing the SCCP layer to access IP primitives like send or receive. However, the SCCP-IP mapping function cannot always make a conversion between IP layer primitives and MTP primitives, generating a pseudo response, if possible, or no mapping at all (col. 3 line 64 to col. 4 line 19, and col. 4 lines 37-56).

In contrast to the Applicant's invention, the MTP-3 layer has been replaced with the IP layer, so its function has been removed in the Glitho reference. The replacement of this function presents a number of problems with Glitho and the anticipation of the Applicant's invention. Transferring signaling information from a first application part to a MTP level 3 is not possible in Glitho since there is no MTP level 3. This also applies to determining a destination address at the MTP level 3 from the destination signaling point identifier.

An additional function of the MTP level 3, such as monitoring remote MTP-3 layers in the SS7 network cannot be carried out with the Glitho reference. As claimed in claim 1, the Applicant's invention teaches the replacement of MTP-2 and MTP-1 by an arrangement that includes an IP layer, and an adaptation layer underneath the MTP-3 layer still in the SS7 stack as depicted in Figure 3 of the application. The MTP-3 layer is a significant part of the Applicant's invention. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Glitho reference fails to disclose a number of the limitations recited in Applicant's claim 1, and thus, claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom are distinguishable from Glitho.

Claim 11 is analogous to Claim 1 and contains similar limitations. The Applicant respectfully asserts that Glitho does not teach or suggest the invention presently claimed in Claims 1 and 11. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 and 11.

The Applicant has overcome the anticipation rejection and at best there would be a 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) rejection. However, the Applicant commonly owns the Glitho reference and the current invention.

Statement of Common Ownership

This present application, and the Glitho reference at the time of the invention of the present application, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson, a Swedish corporation.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glitho in view of the Applicants admitted prior art in the Applicants instant application (hereinafter referred to as Martin).

The Martin reference is cited to further define the signaling point identifier to include a network indicator and a signaling point identifier. However, the limitation of the Applicant's invention regarding the MTP-3 layer is not supplied by the Martin reference. Claims 9-10 depend from claim 1 and contain the same novel limitations as claim 1. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Prior Art Not Relied Upon

In paragraph 7 on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date:

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. This sheet, which includes Fig. 2, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet